

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

JERMAINE JAMAICA CAMPBELL, SR.,
Petitioner,
v.
WARDEN RUSSELL, *et al.*,
Respondents.

Case No. 3:19-cv-00576-MMD-CSD
ORDER

In this habeas corpus action, Respondents filed their answer to the amended habeas petition on May 25, 2022 (ECF No. 75). Then, after an initial period of 45 days, a 60-day extension of time, a 45-day extension of time, a 35-day extension of time, and a 30-day extension of time, Petitioner Jermaine Jamaica Campbell, Sr., who is represented by appointed counsel, was due to file his reply by December 28, 2022. (ECF Nos. 9, 78, 81, 83, 85.) In the order granting the second extension, the Court stated: “[R]eviewing the amended petition and the answer, and considering the amount of time that Campbell will have had to file his reply (about five months), *the Court will not look favorably upon any motion to further extend this deadline.*” (ECF No. 81.) In the order granting the third extension, the Court stated: “[T]he Court will not be inclined to further extend this deadline absent extraordinary circumstances.” (ECF No. 83.) In the order granting the fourth extension, the Court stated: “*The Court does not intend to further extend this deadline absent extraordinary circumstances.*” (ECF No. 85.)

On December 28, 2022, Campbell filed a motion for extension of time (ECF No. 86 (“Motion”)) requesting an additional 21-day extension, to January 18, 2023, for his reply. Campbell’s counsel states—as in the previous requests for extensions—that this extension is necessary because of obligations in other cases. Campbell’s counsel

1 represents that Respondents do not oppose the Motion. Campbell makes no mention in
2 this Motion—or in any of his previous motions for extension of time, for that matter—of
3 the Court’s warnings that it does not approve of further delay of this filing.

4 The Court will grant this motion for extension of time in the interests of justice, that
5 is, with the hope of resolving this case on its merits with the benefit of a reply from
6 Campbell to Respondents’ answer. However, *the Court will not further extend this*
7 *deadline.*

8 It is therefore ordered that Campbell’s Motion for Extension of Time (ECF No. 86)
9 is granted. Campbell will have until and including January 18, 2023, to file a reply to
10 Respondents’ answer. In all other respects, the schedule for further proceedings set forth
11 in the order entered October 21, 2019 (ECF No. 9) will remain in effect.

12 DATED THIS 5th Day of January 2023.

13 
14 _____
15 MIRANDA M. DU
16 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28